UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/765,874	01/29/2004	Thomas F. Perkins	026052-00006 2281		
4372 ARENT FOX	7590 07/09/2007 PLLC	EXAMINER			
1050 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W.			RENDON, CHRISTIAN E		
SUITE 400 WASHINGTO	N, DC 20036		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	•		3714		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
•			07/09/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

÷								
Office Action Summary		Application	n No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/765,874	<b>‡</b>	PERKINS, THOMAS F.				
		Examiner		Art Unit				
		Christian E	. Rendón	3714				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply								
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLICATION OF THE MAILING DISTRICT OF THE MAILIN	ATE OF THI 136(a). In no ever will apply and will e, cause the applic	S COMMUNICATIO nt, however, may a reply be ti expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cation to become ABANDONI	N. imely filed on the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status			·					
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 January 2004.							
2a) <u></u>	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This	on is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This action is non-final.						
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowa	ince except f	or formal matters, pr	osecution as to the merits is				
	closed in accordance with the practice under t	Ex parte Qua	ayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposit	ion of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.  7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Applicat	ion Papers			. ,				
9)[	The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.						
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>29 January 2004</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.								
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
<b>Priority</b>	under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of.  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Burea See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have beer ts have beer prity docume nu (PCT Rule	n received. n received in Applicat nts have been receive 17.2(a)).	tion Noved in this National Stage				
•								
Attachmer	nt(s) .							
2) Notice 3) Infor	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date		4) Interview Summan Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal D 6) Other:	Date				

Art Unit: 3714

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-9, 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticapted by 'Quiz Bingo!' (http://web.archive.org/web/20031130062847/www.geocities.com/alquizzes/Quiz Choicesx.htm)

- 1. The archived site of 'A.L. Quizzes & Games' discloses a game called 'Quiz Bingo!' The set for this version of bingo contains: 50 questions and answers, bingo grids and a set of rules. Each question is associated with a 'number' possibly found on one of the grids. The first player to answer the associated question of a called out 'number' correctly wins the 'square'. The first correct completion of a line: row, column or diagonal or a full house wins a prize. For the record, a full house is a bingo pattern in which a player covers all the numbers on the bingo card.
- 2. Regarding claims 2-3, any version of bingo inherently contains a central selection square labeled 'FREE' on the bingo cards.
- 3. Regarding claims 6 and 8, in bingo a 'host' administrates the game by calling out the selected numbers. Therefore a host is not a participant of a bingo game. In the scope of 'Quiz Bingo!' the host would also ask the questions and confirm the answers in order to keep the game fair. These questions and answers are printed on cards that are turn-able or that can be flipped easily since this is a home game.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3714

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 'Quiz Bingo!' in view of one of ordinary skill.

- 4. The above description of the invention disclosed by 'A.L. Quizzes & Games' and the limitations they pertain is considered within this art rejection as well. In a game of Bingo, the first player to mark a row, column or diagonal and call out Bingo is the winner of the round. In terms of "Quiz Bingo!," the art is silent about how a host will determine which player out of the multiple player has the right to answer a question first. If the game set failed to provide an electronic device that makes a loud sound then the inventor was expecting the players to bring his or her own or to scream out a phrase like 'Bingo' to obtain the right to answer the question. In other words the decision is left to the player since common knowledge is need to fulfill the players' gaming preferences. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to provide a buzzer as a means to obtain the host's attention.
- 5. Regarding claim 11, in the event two players have the right to response to a question the prior art is silent in describing the resolution to this outcome. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to apply the typical trivia game rule. If the player who obtained the right to answer first fails to answer correctly then the second player who was not quick enough to obtain the right to answer, now has a chance to answer the question. This rule is used in many trivia games like 'Jeopardy!' and 'Family Feud' therefore this practice is common knowledge.

Claims 5, 12 and 16-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 'Quiz Bingo!' in view of Seelig et al. (US 7,037,194 B2).

Art Unit: 3714

6. The above description of the invention disclosed by 'A.L. Quizzes & Games' and the limitations they pertain is considered within this art rejection as well. The description of "Quiz Bingo!' is silent about how a number is randomly selected. Most likely this requirement was left to the players to decide since 'Quiz Bingo!' is a non-electrical home game. However, Seelig discloses a slot machine with a jumbled ball display (Seelig: fig. 1a, 12).

- 7. Seelig discloses an electronic device that provides a primary game (col. 6, lines 27-30) and 'Bingo' bonus game (col. 13, lines 38-40). Slot reels that are spun and stop to produce a random result form a matrix of rows and columns that are used to determine a payline. When a player achieves special predefined payline or symbol, he or she proceeds to a bonus game offering a player chance to win a bonus prize (col. 13, lines 11-13).
- 8. Casino game designers are always looking for new ways to produce a device that will increase the excitement and enjoyment experienced by players viewing and interacting with the game (Seelig: col. 14, lines 41-45). Seelig discloses that many different variations of a 'Bingo' bonus game may be utilized (Seelig: col. 13, lines 38-39), which is another means of increasing a player's enjoyment experience. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to incorporate 'Quiz Bingo!' as the 'Bingo' bonus game in the invention disclosed by Seelig to create a unique experience. Casino games that incorporate skills or knowledge in their games offer players a sense of better odds of winning since he or she has some control over the outcome.
- 9. Regarding claims 5 and 12, Seelig discloses that a controller removes and replaces the 'prize balls' (fig. 3, 92) from a rotating ball holder (fig. 3, 58) contained within the machine (col. 9, lines 66-67) & placed in a display window (fig. 1a, 30) for a player to examine (col. 7, lines 41-42).
- 10. Regarding claims 16 and 19, Seelig discloses a touch screen display as a possible input device (col. 8, lines 21-22). Therefore the gaming device must contain a graphical user interface to

Art Unit: 3714

allow a player to activate the available functions. The gaming machine contains a controller adapted to generate a variety of displays (col. 8, lines 15-16).

- 11. Regarding claims 20-21, Seelig discloses the gaming machine containing a communication device (fig. 14, 512) to allow the machine interaction with other devices (col. 16, lines 8-9). This communication device can be a modem, network interface device, or a wireless network communication device (col. 16, lines 11-12), which will allow the gaming machine access to a network like the Internet.
- 12. Regarding claims 17-18, Seelig discloses a slot machine that allows a player to play a game of 'Bingo' on their own or with a group of people (fig. 1C) through a communication device (fig. 14, 512) that provides a network connection, therefore the device is able to function as a terminal.

  Claims 7 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 'Quiz Bingo!' in view of Toss Across (<a href="http://www.joson.com/year/wastheyear/1969.htm">http://www.joson.com/year/wastheyear/1969.htm</a>) as evidenced by (<a href="http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Toss Across">http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Toss Across</a>).
- 13. The above description of the art combination of the invention disclosed by 'A.L. Quizzes & Games' and Seelig, plus the limitations they pertain is considered within this art rejection as well. The 'Quiz Bingo!' game is silent about turn-able tiles or signs that determine a prize.
- 14. The game 'Toss Across' requires players to toss a small beanbag from a considerable distance at a rotatable tile attached to a board. The tile is has three sides: X, O, blank therefore is pyramid shaped. A player can randomly or strategically select a tile to rotate and if the tile rotates to the right symbol the player will winning a prize or the game.
- 15. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine 'Quiz Bingo!' with 'Toss Across' to create a game of luck, skill and intelligence. There is a current market targeting parents who want their young children to play games that encourage learning (asking and answering

Application/Control Number: 10/765,874

Art Unit: 3714

questions) through a fun (luck) and an active (skill) game that has replay value. These parents believe these games will promote a faster and more advance brain development in their children.

16. Regarding claim 7, the prior art discloses pyramid shaped tiles while the applicant has cubed shaped tiles. Since the applicant discloses that only three out of the six sides are in use it is a matter of design choice to have cube shaped tiles instead of pyramid shaped tiles.

## Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christian E. Rendón whose telephone number is 571-272-3117. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert E. Pezzuto can be reached on 571-272-6996. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Christian E Rendón Examiner Art Unit 3714

CER

RONALD LANEAU
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Page 6